

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-38 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-9, 20, and 22-30 have been amended for clarification only. Claims 11-19 have been allowed. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-9, 20, and 22-30 have been amended for clarification purposes. The support for the amendment to the claims is found in allowed claim 11. New claims 31-38 have been added to enhance the scope of patent coverage and are supported by the original claims and page 10, lines 10-23, of the specification as filed. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

Applicant has reviewed the interview summary attached to the Final Office Action dated September 11, 2006, and confirms that the omission of treatment of new claims 27-30 was the topic of discussion.

Claims 27-30 were objected to as having an informality. The term “check parity matrix” has been amended to recite - - parity check matrix - - in accordance to the Patent Office’s objection. It is respectfully requested that the Patent Office remove its objection of claims 27-30.

The Patent Office rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cox, “Subband Speech Coding and Matched Convolutional Channel Coding for Mobile Radio Channels.”

Cox appears to correspond to a prior art approach discussed in the background of the invention as an approach that may have substantial memory requirements (page 4, lines 2-9, of the application as filed).

The Patent Office rejected claims 1-6 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim.

Kim shows (Figure 2, page 2401) examples of a puncturing table for Rate Compatible Punctured Serial Concatenated Convolutional Codes. Like Cox, Kim appears to be directed to a prior art approach discussed in the background of the invention as an approach that may have substantial memory requirements (page 4, lines 2-9, of the application as filed).

The Patent Office rejected claims 1, 2, 4-10, and 20-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mantha, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2003/0126551.

Mantha describes the use of a puncturing table that uses an algorithm based on two parameters in order to generate the puncturing patterns.

Applicant has incorporated subject matter of allowed claim 11 into each of the independent claims 1, 20, 23, and 30 and has also amended claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 7, 9, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30 for clarification.

As previously rejected claims 1-10 and 20-30 recite Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-10 and 20-30 are allowable over Mantha, Cox, or Kim, because alone or in combination, these references do not disclose or suggest the maximum puncture sequence S_{max} is stored in and retrieved from a plurality of memory elements, wherein the sequence S_1 is retrieved from fewer than all of the memory elements of the plurality of memory elements.

The Patent Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Cox, Kim, or Mantha, and to allow all of the pending claims 1-38 as now presented for examination. An early notification of the allowability of claims 1-38 is earnestly solicited.

Serial No. 10/608,943
Art Unit 2133

Respectfully submitted:

Walter J. Malinowski

Walter J. Malinowski

Reg. No.: 43,423



November 1, 2006

Date

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP

4 Research Drive

Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Phone: (203) 925-9400, extension 19

Facsimile: (203) 944-0245

Email: wmalinowski@hspatent.com

CERTIFICATION OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

11/1/2006

Date

Clarie F. Mier

Name of person making deposit